



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,377	10/26/2001	Yair Oren	20568-69181	8715
46363	7590	04/14/2006	EXAMINER	
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP/ LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC 595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702				ROBERTS, BRIAN S
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2616		

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/030,377	OREN, YAIR
	Examiner Brian Roberts	Art Unit 2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

- Applicant's Amendment filed 3/27/2006 is acknowledged.
- Claims 3 and 4 have been cancelled.
- Claims 1-2 and 5-9 remain pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

- In reference to claim 6

Claim 6 recites the limitation "any value of the pointer field other than zero constitutes a valid index into the groups table". The claim does not meet the enablement requirement because any value of the pointer field other than zero allows for the groups table to be of an infinite size. A groups table of infinite size would require an infinite amount of memory. Such a table is impossible to implement or design. The size of the groups table and range of valid values for the pointer field must be finite.

- In reference to claim 7

Claim 7 is rejected as being dependent on claim 6.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 5, and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cedrone et al. (US 6538987) in view of Calvignac et al. (US 6044079)

- In reference to claim 1

In Figure 2, Cedrone et al. teaches a switch that maintains a primary set of routing tables that contains a virtual path index (VPI) table and an associated virtual circuit index (VCI) table for a primary ring and a secondary set of routing tables that contains a virtual path index (VPI) table and an associated virtual circuit index (VCI) table for a secondary ring. When a cell arrives at the switch, a pointer (32a), a VPI key (32b) and a VCI key (34b) is used to index the routing tables to access routing information (34a) for forwarding the cell. If the VPI and VCI keys match, the node uses the routing information. If the VPI and VCI keys do not match the cell is discarded.  
(column 6 lines 30 – column 7 lines 65)

Cendrone et al. does not teach implementing the primary routing tables and the secondary routing in a single groups table or accessing a status field to determine whether a cell should be discarded or forwarded.

In Figure 6, Calvignac et al. teaches a virtual channel connection table indexed utilizing a pointer field that contains a cell discard field (85) (status field) that determines whether a cell should be forwarded or discarded. (column 9 lines 6-43)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Cendrone et al. to include implementing the primary routing tables and secondary tables in a single groups table that includes a cell discard field as taught by Calvignac et al. because it would allow the switch to maintain a single table for the primary and secondary rings that indicates whether each arriving cell should be forwarded or discarded to prevent duplicate copies of the same cell arriving from both the primary and secondary to be unnecessarily forwarded thus wasting bandwidth.

- In reference to claim 2

The combination of Cendrone et al. and Calvignac et al. teaches a system and method that covers substantially all limitations of the parent claim. In Figure 2, Cendrone further teaches an entry for each virtual circuit of each VP/VC group for forwarding cells and forwarding the cells as specified in the routing table. (column 6 lines 30-67)

- In reference to claim 5

The combination of Cedrone et al. and Calvignac et al. teaches a system and method that covers substantially all limitations of the parent claim. In Figure 2, Cedrone et al. inherently teaches that the number of supported groups is determined in part by the number of bits allocated to the pointer field associated with the circuit for the cell. (column 6 lines 30-67)

- In reference to claim 8

The combination of Cedrone et al. and Calvignac et al. teaches a system and method that covers substantially all limitations of the parent claim. In Figure 2, Cedrone et al. teaches implementing a table as part of a module of a switching system. (column 6 lines 30-67)

- In reference to claim 9

The combination of Cedrone et al. and Calvignac et al. teaches a system and method that covers substantially all limitations of the parent claim. In Figure 2, Cedrone et al. inherently teaches that a number of supported VP/V/C groups is determined in part by a size of the groups table. (column 6 lines 30-67)

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Art Unit: 2616

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2 and 5-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure are:

- Foglar (US 5671215) a method and circuit arrangement for transmitting message cells via redundant, virtual path pairs of an AM communication network.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Roberts whose telephone number is (571) 272-3095. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:00-7:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BSR  
04/06/2006



HAASSAN KIZOU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600